



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

give color to the object represented. Shakespeare's style unites poetic rhetoric wealth and splendor of imagery with drastic soul portraiture, while Hebbel's characters are depicted by means of elements gained by psychological analysis and become analytically introspective. They bear Hebbel's stamp by the consciousness of their dependence upon the forces that shape their destiny. Mr. Alberts points out that subjectivity in the wider sense of the word is characteristic of none other than Shakespeare himself.

*University of Illinois.*

E. O. ECKELMANN.

---

THE DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARD ENGLISH  
SPEECH.

By J. M. Hart. Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1907.

The purpose of this little book is to outline the history of English pronunciation. There is no attempt to deal with the growth of the standard vocabulary, with accidence, or with syntax, although the title suggests a work of much broader scope. Yet no one will quarrel with the author's limitation of his subject. Many available books treat in sufficiently clear and succinct manner of these other phases of the history of our language, or of the two first at least; but there is greater need of a clear presentation for beginners of the essential facts in the development of English sounds. Most of the current histories of the language, as Lounsbury's, Toller's, Bradley's, etc., do little more than touch now and then on the oral side of the language. One might work through some of them and hardly be conscious that English is a spoken language at all. The exception is Professor Emerson's *History of the English Language*; but here the discussion of sound changes is merely incidental, and the chapters concerned have hardly been revised since the book was first published, in 1891. Nevertheless the

chapters in this *History*, and the short sketch based on somewhat more recent results of scholarship in this field, included in Mr. M. H. Liddell's edition of Chaucer's *Prologue* (1901), in which Chaucer's sounds are taken forward into Modern English, then referred back into Old English, have remained about the only presentations, in American books, to which a beginner could go for initiation into the historical study of spoken English. There is clear need then of a short exposition concentrating its efforts on the general phenomena, and omitting as far as possible confusing details; and the little book by Professor Hart, which attempts to do just this, is timely and needed. Considering the many valuable German histories of the language, or special treatises having to do with English sounds, as those of Morsbach, Kaluza, Luick, Kluge, Viëtor, and the long accessible works of Ellis and Sweet in England<sup>1</sup>, it is perhaps strange that such a primer as Professor Hart's has not appeared in America before.

After a brief explanatory introduction, Professor Hart's book treats in order of the following topics: vowel changes—lengthening, shortening, changes in vowel quality, diphthongization; consonant changes,—loss and intrusion, voicing, etc., and palatalization. The author endeavors first to give the primary laws of major importance, then the leading details and exceptions, thus adapting the book to the needs of beginners. In the main the book is clear and orderly. We are told in the preface that it may be said, as a whole, to represent Cornell University aim and method.

The development of the borrowed element in Middle English, especially the Old French, might well have received greater stress. It is true that there are references to words borrowed from the French, but these references are neither frequent nor systematic. It would have been a simple matter, without attempting anything further, consistently to enter French loan words among the illustrations given, thus suggesting how they

<sup>1</sup>For a recent English work with a section on English sound changes, cf. Professor H. C. Wyld's *Historical Study of the Mother Tongue*. 1907.

ranged themselves under English sound laws, and incidentally throwing light on points in English orthography; nor would this have involved change in the size or scope of the book, or in its plan. The phonology of the French and the Norse loan elements in Middle English deserves, in general, fuller treatment than it usually receives. Professor Emerson again constitutes an exception. One of the noteworthy features of the phonetic section of his *Middle English Reader* is the consistent attention given to the French and the Norse loan elements and their development alongside of the native element.

Commenting now on certain points of detail in Professor Hart's book:—

(1) Strangely enough no account of the development of M. E. *ǣ* in closed syllables, as in *man* and *that*, which became [æ] in the seventeenth century, is included. There is a discussion of *ā*, and of *ǣ* in open syllables, but of *ǣ* in closed syllables neither in the table on p. 48 nor in the text.

(2) Professor Hart's presentation of the history of M. E. *ē* from O. E. *ē*, *ea*, or from *ě* in open syllables, seems confused, if not defective. In the table, p. 48, he enters as a seventeenth-century sound change, that of *ē* to *ī*, as though there were no intermediate sound between Chaucer's and a seventeenth-century *ī*. In his discussion, p. 27, he writes:—

"The open *ē* survived, for the most part, in Dryden's day. In fact something like it is found in Pope, in foreign words borrowed with the *ē* sound. Thus Pope...rimes *tea* with *obey*. *Obey*, Fr. *obéir*, is still pronounced *obei*, but *tē* has become *ī*."

Further on, he writes:—

"Elizabethan and Cromwellian colonists still pronounced *tēch*, *spēch*, *clēn*, and this was the pronunciation which the Irish learned from them...the uneducated Irish still cling to the older *ē*".

Pope's rhyme was in *ē*, the intermediate sound which Professor Hart's discussion ignores; and this may possibly have been the Elizabethan sound. The *ē* stage had been reached, in any case, in the seventeenth century. The entry should read, M. E.

$\bar{e}$  became  $\bar{e}$ , which became  $\bar{i}$ . For a recent discussion of the value of M. E.  $\bar{e}$  in Shakespeare's pronunciation, cf. Viëtor, *A Shakespeare Phonology*, 1906, § 24.

Similarly, on p. 35, the sentence, "In the eighteenth century the pronunciation [of *either* and *neither*] vacillated between [ $\bar{e}$ ] and [ $\bar{i}$ ]" should read "vacillated between [ $\bar{e}$ ] and [ $\bar{i}$ ]."

Perhaps the whole confusion arises from the value which the symbol  $\bar{e}$  has for Professor Hart. When one reads on p. 18, "For example, *paste*, *taste*, *waste*, *haste*, 'hurry'<sup>1</sup>, pronounced  $\bar{a}$  in Chaucer's day<sup>2</sup>, are now pronounced [ $p\bar{e}st$ ] etc.", one is inclined to think that, to Professor Hart,  $\bar{e}$  means  $\bar{e}$ . The words cited have now rather  $\bar{e}$  or, strictly,  $\bar{e}i$  [ $p\bar{e}ist$ ] than  $\bar{e}$ ! Yet, on p. 25, the author expressly distinguishes between the open vowel, written  $\bar{e}$  and the close vowel, written  $\bar{e}$  or  $\bar{e}$ ; and on the preceding page,  $\bar{e}$  is given, as it should be, for the M. E. value of words from O. E.  $\bar{e}a$  and  $\bar{e}.$

(3) A beginner would find Professor Hart's treatment of M. E.  $\bar{a}$  in open syllables far from lucid. In the table p. 48, he enters as a change taking place in the thirteenth century the lengthening of  $\bar{a}$  in open syllables. Then, just below, among fifteenth-century changes in vowel values, he notes that of  $\bar{a}$  to  $\bar{e}$  in open syllables. Surely he should read  $\bar{a}$  to  $\bar{e}$ , in the latter case. By his own entry just above, he would have left no fifteenth-century  $\bar{a}$ 's in open syllables. That we have not to deal with a printer's error here is shown by the reading of the text on p. 30, where Professor Hart speaks of the "lengthening of  $\bar{a}$  to [ $\bar{e}$ ]." Toward the foot of the page, he writes, "In Chaucer's language such words as *face*, *grace*, *age*, have the [ $a$ ] not the [ $\bar{e}$ ] sound". Rather did they have the  $\bar{a}$  sound; compare the author's own entry of M. E. *māken*, on p. 11.

In general § 11 should be re-stated, and the sequence, O. E.  $\bar{a}$  in open syllables became Middle English  $\bar{a}$ , which became Elizabethan  $\bar{a}$ , which became modern  $\bar{e}i$ , clearly brought out. *Fare*, which so puzzles the author, remains at an intermediate

<sup>1</sup>Why give the meaning of *haste*, when the meanings of the other words cited are not given?

<sup>2</sup>Some scholars would say  $\bar{a}$ .

stage, as so often with words containing *r*; e. g., *bear*, *great*, *break*, etc., from M. E. *ġ*. Compare Viëtor § 35, p. 54. At the end of § 11, it would help the student, where the author writes, "Thus *age*, *sage*, etc. . . in Mn. E. *ē*," and "Why do we pronounce *face* [*ē*] but *chāpel*?" etc., if he distinguished more clearly between an early Modern English sound and present English. In present English we certainly do not say *face* with *ġ*. Cf. just above, however, under (2), for the contradictory values which the author seems to attach to the symbol *ē*.

(4) On p. 21 is the entry, "Perhaps the shortening of *ænig* [if not due to the suffix *-ig*] is due to the influence of *many*". More likely the vowel of *many*, O. E. *monig*, is due to that of *any*, O. E. *ānig*, helped perhaps by the influence of the O. E. noun *menigu*, 'throng'. Cf. expressions like "a great many men". Which of the two forms was the earlier to appear, [*eny*] or [*meny*] ? At all events, it would add to the clearness here if some comment were introduced on the vowel of *many*, since it is hardly that which the student could at once account for.

(5) On p. 70, the course of the twelfth century is given as the time when initial *γ* became a stop before *ǣ*, *ǝ*, *ǣ*. The change is generally placed much earlier, somewhere about the year 1000. Cf. Kluge, Kaluza, or H. C. Wyld, *Historical Study of the Mother Tongue*, p. 225.

(6) On p. 32 occurs "The [*ə*] is found also in some words which had an O. E. *ū*, or O. E. *ū*, in open syllable in M. E." Why mislead by adding the qualifying "in open syllable in M. E." ? The change occurs just as often in the case of *ū* in closed syllables: cf. *cup*, *sung*; indeed it is a normal change in the latter case.

(7) On p. 13, in dealing with "some exceptions to the law of open syllable lengthening", Professor Hart writes:—

"Some exceptions are difficult to explain. Thus O. E. *hēofon* is still short in Mn. E. Perhaps this is due to the heavy suffix *-on*. The O. E. *dēofol* is *dēvil* (short *e*) in Mn. E.<sup>1</sup> Orm writes *heoffness*, *heffness* (short *e*) but *deofless*, *defless* (long

<sup>1</sup> Having originally a long vowel, *dēofol* should hardly be treated along with *heofon*, *roten*, etc., under "vowel lengthenings", or "exceptions to lengthenings".

e)...M. E. *roten* (from Scand. *rotinn*) has remained short; whereas O. E. *brocen*, M. E. *broken*, has been lengthened”.

Professor Hart nowhere formulates very definitely the principle called by Professor Sweet “back shortening.” Some words, under the conditions in point, were undoubtedly lengthened, then shortened again, as the spelling shows. Only on p. 8 does he verge on the principle involved, and in treating the effect of certain terminations, *-tig, -ig, -en*, and *-el, -ol, -et*, in § 7. He would do better, and would clear up many of the points which puzzle him, if he treated the whole matter in one place and in its logical way. When the second syllable consists of a short vowel and *l, r, n*, or *m*, (in French words *-le*), there is sometimes lengthening and sometimes not. Also, original long vowels are sometimes shortened and sometimes not. In general two developments might be expected with words showing, like those under discussion, both open and closed syllables: *dēofol, dēofles; fader, fadres; wāpen, wāpnes*. Orm writes *faderr, waterr* (lengthened); but *fādres, wātres, wēpnes* would be M. E. genitive or plural forms. Some words still show traces of both developments, as the Scotch *deil* (long vowel) beside *devil*; or the dialectal [*wīpen*] beside *weapon*.

Under a treatment of the influence of certain terminations, *-l, -m, -n, -r, -y*, might conveniently belong Professor Hart’s discussion, p. 31, of certain words from the French, *chapel, cattle, marry*. It is important to note the position of the accent when the words were borrowed; for French words with initial stress generally showed lengthening, as *table, noble, glory*; but that the position of the accent does not deserve the sole stress is shown by the number of native words with original initial accent, which remained short also; e. g. *feter* ‘fetter,’ *ratelen* ‘rattle’; or by M. E. *ketel*, borrowed from the O. N. *ketill*, ‘kettle’; or by native words which had originally long vowels but became short. It is very likely that the words cited by Professor Hart would have remained short, had they been native instead of loan words and had the accent been on the first syllable. The passage on p. 31 is, by the way, one of the few passages in the book referring to the development of French words in English.

(8) On p. 15 the author notes a law that "the heavy infinitive ending *-ian* of the second weak class did shorten a long vowel", as in O. E. *hālgian* 'hallow', beside O. E. *hālig* 'holy'. But the *-ian* certainly did not shorten the vowel, or keep it short, in other words of this verb class; e. g., *lician* 'like', *lōcian* 'look', *behōfian* 'behoove', *bodian* 'bode', *wanian* 'wane'. The M. E. form *halwen*, with change of *g* to *w*, is sufficient to explain the vowel of *hallow*, by the M. E. law of shortening before two consonants. Cf. Emerson, *Middle English Reader*, § 76, (c); Wyld, p. 271, etc.

(9) On p. 26, Professor Hart writes "Old Mercian *ē*, the *i*-umlaut of *ēa* (the W. S. form was *īe*), was open *ē̄* in M. E." He cites, to illustrate this law, O. E. *hēran*, M. E. *hēren*, modern *hear*. But Old Mercian *ē*, the *i*-umlaut of *ēa*, gave close *ē̄* in M. E. Cf. *gelēven*, W. S. *geliefan*, M. E. *lēven*, Mn. E. *believe*. *Hear*, despite the spelling, probably had *ē̄* in M. E.; as, for example, in Chaucer's *Prologue* (l.170), where it is rhymed with *clē̄r*, from O. Fr. *cler*.

There are a number of other points, most of them minor, in which one is inclined to take issue with the treatment given by Professor Hart; but enough has been said in the way of detailed comment. The author of any phonological sketch such as that under discussion, would have, of course, to expect a good deal of variance from his views among those who use his book. There can be no doubt with regard to the assistance which *Standard English Speech* will afford to the beginner. Probably the section entitled "Palatalization" will be found especially useful and well presented. The book is unusually free from typographical errors.

*University of Nebraska.*

LOUISE POUND.